

occurred a little while ago. Had I been recorded, my vote would have been in the affirmative.

#### FOUNDING DOCUMENTS IN NATIONAL ARCHIVES

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, recently, the National Archives released a report in which they concluded a structural nature of racism permeates all aspects of work and workplace culture at the National Archives. Unbelievable.

Among other things, they claim that the rotunda where our founding documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights—are housed are displayed as an example of structural racism. Also, they called out the praise of our Founders that constructed those documents as being somehow triggering of people.

The report recommends that we reimagine—a buzzword, these days—the rotunda at the National Archives, including staging dance and performance art in the space that invites dialogue about the ways the United States has mythologized the Founding era.

So rather than celebrating our independence, like we will in a few days, we will be focused on the U.S. failures or flaws. It seems we have enough bashing of our country, our flag, even our National Anthem, as we saw at a track and field event of a would-be Olympian who turned away from our anthem.

The report also calls for putting in place trigger warnings for those who would view and see the display there.

We are losing our minds, folks. These are our founding documents.

#### REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today with an opportunity for this body and the United States Congress to save lives.

The Hyde amendment has been an essential safeguard that has defended the unborn and protected millions of lives for more than 40 years. A recent estimate credits the Hyde amendment with saving more than 2.4 million precious and innocent lives.

Historically, measures which prevent taxpayer dollars from being used to perform abortions have garnered strong bipartisan support. In fact, President Biden was a vocal supporter of the Hyde amendment during his decades of service in the U.S. Senate.

However, it is clear that Democrats in Washington have changed their mind, as they have recently made it

their mission to eliminate these longstanding protections and force families in west Michigan and across the Nation to violate their deeply held beliefs by funding abortions on demand with their hard-earned tax dollars.

I believe, as millions of Michiganders and those across America believe, we must embrace a culture that protects the values of life. Using taxpayer dollars to end the lives of innocent children is wrong.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

#### RECOGNIZING LEWIS CHITENGWA

(Mr. ROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, in December 1992, my friend, Lewis Chitengwa, defeated Tiger Woods in a tournament called the Orange Bowl in Florida.

A year later, my friend, Lewis Chitengwa, was denied entrance and asked to go into the back where the caddies go in when he went to the South African Amateur Championship. He went on to win that tournament, becoming the first Black man to win the South African Amateur.

Unfortunately, 20 years ago this Wednesday, my friend, Lewis, my brother in Christ, my teammate at the University of Virginia, went to see the Lord when he passed away from viral meningitis.

My teammates will be regaling his life this Wednesday. I am going to take to the floor for a Special Order in July to talk more about this man, who was ultimately inducted into the Hall of Fame in South Africa with a speech from the famous Gary Player.

#### DEFENDING RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today in hosting a Special

Order on the Second Amendment, which is both near and dear to my heart and which is also near and dear to the many millions of Americans who cherish their rights and freedoms.

The Second Amendment says: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Though it brings me great joy to talk at length about the Second Amendment and the foresight our Founding Fathers had to enshrine this God-given right into the U.S. Constitution, I regret that lawmakers today must still rise to defend it, a matter that was settled 230 years ago.

We must still do this because the Second Amendment is, again, under direct and constant attack from not just gun control activist groups and the left, but now from our very own government within the executive branch.

The Founding Fathers enumerated our right to keep and bear arms in the Bill of Rights to ensure the people had the ability to protect themselves from a treacherous government that sought tyranny over democracy.

We know, Madam Speaker, and our Founding Fathers knew as well, that the first step toward tyranny is to disarm the citizenry.

The irony is not lost on me that the Democrats in control today are trying to do everything they can to gain power and keep power through rule changes and enacting sweeping laws that will forever tilt the scales of that power in their favor.

□ 2000

It was announced just this past week that Republicans and Democrats were able to strike a deal on an infrastructure plan which was heralded as great news and no easy feat in this partisan body. But then the news broke that the Democrats wanted to add to the bipartisan agreement a vast human infrastructure proposal. What is human infrastructure?

So now infrastructure becomes redefined to be anything they want it to be. So if you cannot get something done legitimately via legislation because you don't have the votes, then the new tactic is to accomplish it by redefinition. Just redefine the meaning of the word. So when does this act of redefining everything as we know it stop?

Madam Speaker, I fear that it won't, and I see that to be true when it comes to attacks on the Second Amendment, as the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms' newly proposed rules on the definition of a frame or receiver and on pistol stabilizing braces makes that abundantly clear. Through these proposed regulations, the administration is attempting to unilaterally redefine what constitutes a firearm under Federal law and in doing so, restrict the rights of law-abiding gun owners.

In some cases, the courts have not ruled in ATF's way, so ATF wants to change the rules, so the courts have to

abide by new regulations more favorable to them. The ATF wants to increase their influence and authority and do it by edict, making it harder on law-abiding citizens to own firearms. They want a new definition for a firearm, one that will greatly expand its meaning and give ATF immense additional authority.

It was Congress who created the law that defines a firearm. ATF does not have that authority. We have a separation of powers issue here that ATF wants to ignore. It seems they don't want the representatives of the people to have a say. No, ATF wants to make the change themselves and thereby increase their own power. This is wrong thinking and it is dangerous.

Before I go further, let me pause for a second and review the legislative history of our key gun laws.

Congress passed the National Firearms Act, or NFA, in 1934; the Gun Control Act, or GCA, in 1968; and the Firearms Owners' Protection Act in 1986. While two of these acts have since been amended, with the GCA amending portions of the NFA, the current definition of the term "firearm" can be found in the GCA under 18 U.S.C. 921 and has been effectively used for over 50 years.

But the ATF has decided to expand its authority by proposing broad and arbitrary definitions of industry terms including some that are not even referenced in the definition section of the current law, including the terms, "privately made firearm," and "complete weapon."

It is one thing for an agency to use its regulatory authority to clarify terms included in statute for purposes of implementation, but it is clear to me that the ATF has overstepped its authorities by legislating new terms not even referenced in the statute.

Under one of the proposed new regulations, a dummy receiver or an 80 percent lower would now be considered a firearm as it would be covered by the grossly expanded definition of a frame or receiver.

As you can see in the illustration right here, you see the difference between the two. The top is actually functional. The other one on the bottom is a solid block of metal with no ability to accept a firing mechanism, no hammer, no trigger, no selector. And so it is completely nonfunctional.

Now, let's look at those same two from the top-down view. Do you see the difference right here? The bottom one is a solid block of metal, but the top has been machined and has places for a trigger and a hammer and a selector. To make the bottom one work, you have to have the tools and the skill of a manufacturer.

So let's take a closer look at the dummy receiver, Madam Speaker, right here. This solid block of metal doesn't look like a firearm to me and it certainly doesn't work like one either. There is not even a hole right down here for a trigger. The ATF, in its own

rule, noted that Congress recognized that regulation of all firearm parts was impractical back when this body was debating the GCA in 1968.

And in fact, Congress moved to make the regulation of the firearms industry more efficient and functional by striking language in the term "firearm," that would have resulted in regulation of any part or parts of a firearm. Just like the bolt in the upper receiver assembly pictured right here, they are not firearms now. But ATF wants to make this a firearm.

But there is another aspect of this redefinition that will go completely unnoticed unless it is challenged, and that is taxation. The more pieces and parts the ATF can call firearms, the more excise tax they can collect. Let that sink in for a minute. Yes, this is another tax hidden in the price of a firearm.

Every firearm manufacturer pays a 10 or 11 percent excise tax to the ATF based on the invoice price when they sell a firearm to a dealer. So through this redefinition, the government is going to make more tax money on the backs of law-abiding citizens. And will Congress have passed a new law to increase taxes? No. The ATF will have created a new stream of tax revenue by simply changing the definition of a firearm frame or receiver. More taxation at the whim of ATF.

The Second Amendment recognizes the right endowed by our creator and codifies it into law. Taxation of a constitutional right is unconstitutional. But if this redefinition is allowed to stand, then this will only be the beginning of more and more taxation on citizens' gun rights. ATF knows that they cannot make the law more stringent without action by Congress, and they know that such support does not exist in Congress. So they try a flanking maneuver and end run to bypass the legislative branch.

They believe that they, along with gun control activists like David Chipman, can use the authority of the ATF, a law enforcement agency, as a political pawn to carry out their anti-Second Amendment agenda.

Madam Speaker, that is exactly what the ATF is doing, as we speak. One day you have a perfectly legal firearm or part, the next day you wake up and your firearm is no longer legal as defined by ATF. Such legality must be left to Congress to decide as it has done through the legislation I previously referenced; not decided by unelected Federal bureaucrats, bureaucrats that may soon be led by a radical gun control activist named David Chipman, unless my colleagues in the Senate oppose his nomination, and I trust they will.

I fear, Madam Speaker, that if my Senate counterparts do not thwart his nomination, we will have more redefining of words led by a partisan, radical gun control activist. I call it legislation by redefinition.

But this abuse of power can be stopped, Madam Speaker, and I invite

you to join me in defending our rights by submitting comments directly to the ATF through the Federal Register notice. The two proposed rules I have referenced so far are available online for the public to read and have collectively received more than 180,000 comments so far.

One rule is called, "Definition of 'Frame or Receiver' and Identification of Firearms." The other rule is called, "Factoring Criteria for Firearms with Attached 'Stabilizing Braces'."

Madam Speaker, I believe all Americans, especially gun owners, should inform themselves of the proposed changes and share their thoughts directly with the ATF through the public comment opportunity at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). It is written right here.

The public comment period will last for just a few more weeks, and I would love to see the total number of submitted comments hit half a million for each proposed rule. I think every single member of this body agrees with my belief that criminals who misuse firearms and perpetuate violent crimes should be held accountable for their actions. And I also hope my colleagues would concur with my belief that law-abiding firearm owners should not be punished because of the illegal acts of a few who knowingly commit evil acts.

But rather than focusing their efforts on punishing criminals who use firearms in the commission of a crime, my Democratic colleagues have, instead, chosen again and again to slowly chip away at the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

H.R. 8 and H.R. 1446 are prime examples of Democrat-led efforts to curtail Americans' Second Amendment rights. That is why I introduced H.R. 1787, the Ensuring SAFETY Act which would mandate the Federal Government respond to a background check in three calendar days and not allow them to delay background checks potentially indefinitely as happened during the pandemic.

Madam Speaker, I am thrilled to have so many of my colleagues join me in standing before you today to speak in defense of the Constitution and the Second Amendment.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), our conference secretary, from the Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise, a proud defender of our rights as guaranteed in the Second Amendment.

Ever since I was a little boy, my grandfather taught me the right way to handle a gun. I have loved the outdoors and appreciate the freedom that comes from our Second Amendment.

As an adult, I came to understand the Second Amendment is the right that allows us to defend all of our other rights. Unfortunately, the Biden administration has declared war on the Second Amendment. In just the past 6 months, the President and my colleagues across the aisle have pushed

numerous gun control policies that would have zero impact on violence but threaten law-abiding citizens.

The most recent example is a proposed rule from the ATF to impose a new tax and ban on stabilizing braces. This proposed regulation jeopardizes the right of law-abiding gun owners, including disabled combat veterans who rely on these braces. In fact, these braces were invented to assist disabled veterans.

Should this rule go into effect, a disabled veteran who has chosen the best brace for their disability is now breaking the law unless they turn in or destroy the firearm, destroy the brace, or pay a \$200 tax. This radical policy could make millions of law-abiding citizens into felons overnight.

Recently, I led 140 Members of Congress to call on the ATF to withdraw that regulation. Forty-eight Senators also joined this effort, and we are united in pushing back against this extreme gun control agenda. Moms and dads, sons and daughters, and, yes, disabled veterans—every law-abiding American should have the right to protect themselves and exercise their rights as enshrined in our Constitution.

That is why I have also been a leader on expanding concealed carry reciprocity across our country. As the author of H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, I am working to ensure law-abiding concealed carry permit holders do not become criminals when they cross an invisible State line. It is common sense. Due, in part, to rising crime sweeping our Nation, legal gun ownership has reached record highs, making H.R. 38 needed now more than ever. These millions of Americans looking to defend themselves and their families deserve to have their rights respected and protected.

Madam Speaker, I agree with my colleagues who say we must do more to protect our schools and our communities, but the answer is never taking guns away from law-abiding citizens. It is supporting good police officers, hardening our schools, building on the STOP School Violence Act, and investing in mental healthcare. These are all accomplishments of the last Republican House majority.

I hope my colleagues across the aisle will work with me to build on these solutions which should be overwhelmingly bipartisan. Together, we can make real change without dismantling the Second Amendment.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representative ANDREW CLYDE for his leadership on defending our Second Amendment, and for hosting this excellent Special Order tonight.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) for introducing the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, a bill that I am proud to support as a cosponsor.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), my good friend from Texas' 22.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, crime is rising across the country. Double-digit increases in violent crime have been seen in cities across our country; liberal cities, no less, that chose to defund their police. This shouldn't be a surprise to anyone here. When you defund the police, you have less police. And less police means more criminals on the streets.

Rather than address the poor policy decisions that have led to this increase in violent crime, like defunding police, Democrats are attempting to deflect blame on to gun owners. Law-abiding gun owners in this country are frequently attacked by the radical left as being the source of the gun violence problem. The left wants to tell them what guns they can own and how they should be able to purchase them.

As a former county sheriff, I know firsthand how important gun ownership is. When someone lives in a remote part of the country, they can't afford to wait for a 20-minute law enforcement response time in the event of a home invasion. That person needs quick access to a firearm to defend themselves and their loved ones. And that is exactly what legal gun ownership is about, defending one's liberty from would-be attackers.

Law-abiding gun owners are not the source of the problem with gun crimes across the country. It is criminals who have no regard for the law. Taking away or limiting a law-abiding citizen's access to legally purchasing a firearm will only hurt law-abiding citizens. We must protect the Second Amendment rights of all Americans. It is a foundational right of our Republic and must not be infringed.

Republicans in the House must stand firm as the radical left continues their assault. If we lose the Second Amendment, all others will be in jeopardy. "Shall not be infringed." It is that simple.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative NEHLS for his comments. He is truly a staunch supporter of law enforcement, as am I.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), from my home State, who represents Georgia's First District.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to show my support for the Second Amendment and draw attention to its importance. I would like to start by emphasizing a line from the Second Amendment. "... the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

Let me repeat that: "... shall not be infringed." I emphasize this point because today there are many efforts to infringe and abridge this essential right. There are a lot of misconceptions surrounding the Second Amendment, but let me make it clear, the Second Amendment enshrines the right to self-protection in defense of liberty for all Americans.

The right to protect yourself is not given to us by our government. As part of the Bill of Rights, the Second Amendment was not intended to comprehensively define the scope of our right to bear arms. Rather, it serves as a prohibition on certain actions our government can take to infringe on that right

□ 2015

The Biden administration, however, misunderstands this point. In a statement last week, the White House stated that the Second Amendment limits the type of people who could own a gun. Further, it continues to seek to restrain Americans' rights through other actions.

A recent example is the administration's move to strictly regulate stabilizing braces that have allowed disabled individuals to more easily enjoy their constitutionally protected right.

Americans bought 15.1 million guns during the 7-month period from March through September of 2020, which was a 91 percent leap from the same period in 2019. The FBI also processed more background checks for gun purchases in just the first 9 months of 2020 than it had for any previous full year.

Americans want to be safer, and guns give them that sense of security. In spite of that fact, my colleagues across the aisle have made it their mission to restrict this liberty in the name of safety.

However, there is no link between the number of guns and gun violence in the U.S. The number of guns in America rose nearly 50 percent between 1993 and 2013. During the same period, gun homicides fell by nearly 50 percent.

In fact, violent crime has been decreasing for decades, despite an increase last year, during which we also saw calls for defunding the police. In 2019, the violent crime rate fell to the second lowest total rate since 1971, and the murder rate was less than half of what it was at the 1980 peak.

Restricting the Second Amendment is simply not the answer. This right, preserved in our Constitution generations ago, cannot be taken away from ourselves and future generations. We must protect from intrusions on our right to protect ourselves, no matter how hard the left works to strip us of this principle.

Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in standing up for our Second Amendment right to bear arms.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative CARTER for his inspiring words.

Madam Speaker, I ask this: If we grant an 18-year-old individual the right to cast a vote, which decides the fate of our Nation, and can ask them to serve in our Armed Forces, should we not also grant that individual the right to keep and bear arms, which is granted by the Constitution?

I am proud to support a bill introduced by my friend from Kentucky, Mr.

MASSIE, which would restore Second Amendment rights to individuals of voting age.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the good gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate his unwavering support for the Second Amendment.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because, just last week, our President of this country spoke about using the nuclear option. He wasn't talking about getting rid of the 60-vote rule in the Senate. He was actually contemplating a nuclear conflagration with the citizens of this country, with the patriots of this country. He said they should get F-15s and nuclear weapons if they wanted to keep this government in check.

Those aren't the words of George Washington. Those would be the words of King George.

Imagine if a dictator—just imagine the dictator of North Korea or the despot who runs Iran had muttered or stuttered or uttered these words like our President would and did. There would be an international outcry today to have that dictator removed.

We need to hold our chief executive accountable for these words. And our chief executive of this country would do well to understand what the Second Amendment is really about. It is about keeping an overzealous executive in check. It is about securing all of the other liberties in this constitution. It is about the patriots who are willing to tell the government: We are in charge.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative MASSIE for those inspiring words.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the good gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his conviction and his dedication to this issue and getting us this opportunity for all of us to share that.

I appreciate the remarks from my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky. I couldn't agree more about how offensive what we heard from the President of the United States with respect to our Second Amendment protected rights; and then coming in and talking about the foolishness of our desire to have our Second Amendment rights protected when, in fact, we would be up against F-15s and potential nuclear weapons.

Imagine the absurdity of having the President of the United States say that.

Meanwhile, I live in Austin, Texas, where currently crime rates are skyrocketing. Murder rates almost double.

Why might that be?

The President of the United States gave a speech allegedly about crime.

Did he talk about the defunding of police? Did he talk about the \$150 million stripped out of the budget in Austin, Texas?

How about Oakland right now, doubling down on their foolish defunding of the police?

It wasn't enough to take \$15 million out of it last time, and now seeing murder rates skyrocket. They are now doubling down for another \$16 million. They think that is going to solve their problems.

The genius of the current administration, my Democrats on the other side of the aisle, is to take police off the streets and then come after our Second Amendment rights.

How about the border of Texas?

The border of Texas is wide open with cartels operating fully from the Gulf of Mexico all the way up through Big Bend. They have operational control of our border. We have images of gunmen coming across the Rio Grande. We have humans being sold into sex trafficking and human trafficking. We have 7,500 pounds of fentanyl pouring across our border; Americans dying in this opioid epidemic. We have Americans in danger.

And what do Democrats want to do?

Take away our Second Amendment rights to defend ourselves as they defund police and empower cartels.

That is your Democratic Party, ladies and gentlemen. They want you to be in danger. They want you to have to suffer the consequences of their rote incompetence and disbelief in your ability to take care of your own families and your communities.

The President of the United States actually said the other day that, in fact, you are not allowed to have a cannon.

Well, you know what?

In Texas, there was a moment when we had a cannon and we looked at the Mexicans and we said: Come and take it, in 1835.

And that is what I say to the President of the United States: Come and take it, because it is our Second Amendment rights and we are going to defend ourselves.

And when he asks why we need 20 rounds of ammo, maybe it is because he is saying that he wants to come after the American people with F-15s and nuclear weapons.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas 21 for his passionate defense of our Second Amendment rights.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST).

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I would just say this: Number one, I think you would do well to turn off the phone and pay attention to this Special Order while you have the honor of presiding over the floor of the House of Representatives. The words being spoken are important here.

I would just share a brief anecdote with you, and it is this: I have spent many nights in combat. And like many of my friends, helmet, night-vision optics, lots of Velcro camo, backpack. I was a bomb technician, so I normally carried 30, 40 pounds of explosives. I had my side arm. I had my carbine. I

had a metal detector and a number of other things. I normally had about 10 magazines across the front of my vest. And we were heavy. We were carrying a lot of weight on any given night. And every single night, both myself and my brothers in arms would decide how many more magazines we were going to put into our backpacks, into our kits, because we always felt that the dumbest reason for any of us to die would be for a lack of shooting back.

And I think that is something that would, in turn, be one of the dumbest reasons for any law-abiding American to bring about their death, would be because they can't shoot back.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those inspiring words. As a fellow combat veteran, I honor his service and I honor his speech this evening.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), who sent out an amicus brief, and I was proud to cosponsor that brief. I thank her for defending our Second Amendment in that brief.

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting this great Special Order on a fundamental right.

Madam Speaker, our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms for self-protection is a fundamental right protected by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

However, many States, including my own home State of New York, home to Remington Arms, of all places, unconstitutionally restricts our right to carry concealed outside of our home. In most New York jurisdictions, an applicant must justify their need for such a concealed carry permit.

Despite the plain words of the Second Amendment enshrined for centuries in the Bill of Rights, State and local authorities in New York continue to reject applications for law-abiding Americans for entirely arbitrary reasons or for no reason at all. States like California and Massachusetts do exactly the same thing.

This arbitrary standard must be rejected. That is why I am leading the amicus brief for an upcoming U.S. Supreme Court, New York State Rifle and Pistol Association v. Corlett. This case will decide if New York's burdensome concealed carry law violates the Second Amendment.

A little background on the case: In 2016, Rensselaer County, New York, officials denied the concealed carry permit of Robert Nash for the purpose of self-defense. Later, in 2018, they also denied the concealed carry application of Brandon Koch for the same reason.

Both these individuals are honorable, upstanding, and law-abiding citizens. They met every requirement of New York's rigorous concealed carry license application. These two men simply applied for a concealed carry permit for personal protection after a rash of robberies in their neighborhoods and their community.

New York State is now witnessing the highest crime rate that we have had in the history of our State. However, even after all of that, the county licensing officers did not believe that self-defense was a valid exercise of constitutional rights under the Second Amendment.

The gun control measures being considered by the Supreme Court in this key case amount to a blanket ban on the right to keep and bear arms outside the home. The amicus brief I am submitting, with the support of more than 50 Members of the House of Representatives so far, defends citizens' rights against elected officials and government bureaucrats who are attempting to deny these fundamental constitutional rights to all Americans.

We argue that it is unconstitutional for the government to apply a balancing test for a fundamental right such as the Second Amendment under our Constitution. The Bill of Rights was drafted and passed to protect citizens from government overreach.

It is worth noting that New York is an original colony with a very strong history of citizens who stood up for our basic rights. In 1788 and 1789, before and during the Constitutional Convention and the founding of our Federal Constitution, New York's leaders refused to sign on to our Federal Constitution until—until—the Bill of Rights was added to our founding document. They knew how important Second Amendment rights were then, and how important they were to a self-governing constitutional Republic such as ours.

The success of the plaintiff, law-abiding gun owners in this case, will end this improper interpretation of our constitutional right to keep and bear arms, and will be the first major pro-Second Amendment decision considered by the U.S. Supreme Court since *Heller v. District of Columbia*.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members who take their oath to uphold the Constitution seriously to sign on to this amicus brief. Together, we can all protect our Second Amendment rights for all Americans.

I, again, want to thank Mr. CLYDE for his tenacious advocacy on behalf of our God-given constitutional rights, and all of my colleagues here today who are standing up for all Americans.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her inspiring words and her work on this very important amicus brief.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT), a fiery defender of our Second Amendment because she knows exactly what is at stake.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE), for putting this together.

Madam Speaker, I want to begin this evening by thanking my Democrat colleagues for their outstanding work in encouraging millions of Americans to celebrate their Second Amendment

rights by purchasing their first, second, or even 100th firearm.

From the last riots in cities across America, to Biden's threat to strip away our basic constitutional rights, Democrats are singlehandedly responsible for the sale of tens of millions of firearms.

□ 2030

Bravo. Well done. I hear that the interest has begun to peak when it comes to the sale of F-15s.

Now, I have some questions for these freedom-haters. When are you going to call on the Chief Executive, the basement dweller, to hold his own son accountable for his gun crimes? Hunter Biden lied on a Federal firearms application, which is punishable by up to 10 years and a \$250,000 fine, of which 10 percent will not be going to the big guy.

Rules for thee but not for my crackhead, parmesan-smoking, gun criminal son?

What about the disposal of Hunter Biden's gun in a back-alley dumpster? Why was the Secret Service involved in locating this firearm? Can you just imagine, for half a second, if Donald Trump, Jr., was involved in firearms crimes, and his dad ordered the Secret Service to cover it up?

That is just the start of the hypocrisy. Biden will call widely purchased firearms "weapons of war," but then he will tell you that you need an F-15 or a nuke to keep the Federal Government in check. He will target so-called "merchants of death" but celebrate the 600 abortion clinics across America. This regime will encourage riots, defund the police, and try to take away Americans' rights to self-defense.

Madam Speaker, the American people are not on board with the Biden regime's hypocritical gun-grabbing. Instead, they are buying guns at a record rate. So my colleagues from the other side, they can keep running their mouths, and we will keep adding to our arsenals.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado's Third District for her excellent remarks and reminding us of the investigation that needs to be initiated on the purchase of a firearm by Hunter Biden, a 4473 that was not filled out correctly, which is a violation of law.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), representing Pennsylvania's 10th District.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting us this evening.

Every single person here laments the crime that is occurring in our country, the people that lose their lives to crime. Every single one of us laments that, especially when it comes to the inability to defend yourself or your family. It is unacceptable; it is horrific.

Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, want to defund the police and disarm

America, essentially destroying the Constitution.

Now, they will tell you it is all about safety, because they, too, lament these lost lives as we do. But ladies and gentlemen, it is not really about safety; it is about control.

Now, there is a country close to us that has pretty strict gun control. There is one gun store in the country to our south, one, where you can buy a gun legally. The country is Mexico. Their homicide rate is five to six times that of the United States.

Remember, we lament every single lost life, especially those where people cannot defend themselves.

But that is what this is about. My friends on the other side of the aisle want to destroy the Constitution to control you.

Like I said, we lament every single lost life. In Mexico, you can barely own a firearm legally, with five or six times the murder rate.

What is happening in the United States of America? We are defunding the police and taking the rights and the ability of law-abiding citizens away from them to defend themselves in these cities: Chicago, New York City, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Detroit—strictest gun control in America. It is actually worse there than it is in Mexico. It is actually worse there, 10 times the homicide rate.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not let the Federal Government take your rights away. The Constitution says this right shall not be infringed upon.

I come from Pennsylvania, and it says the right to defend yourself—the right to defend yourself, the right to bear arms and defend yourself shall not be questioned. We are not going to allow it to be questioned here.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania for reminding us of how tremendously important the Second Amendment is.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD), my good friend and colleague who represents Virginia's Fifth District.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the right to keep and bear arms for self-defense and to ensure we remain a free people is a God-given right, not a government-bestowed privilege.

We are, however, privileged to live in a country whose Founders correctly and appropriately recognized this God-given right and codified it in the highest law of the land, the Constitution.

The wording of the Second Amendment is assumptive in nature. The right to keep and bear arms is assumed to already exist, and our Founders merely provided legal clarity and protection that it not be infringed.

Government officials who do right and follow the Constitution have nothing to fear from an armed citizenry. However, government officials who oppress their people and violate their Constitutional oath and the rights guaranteed by that Constitution for

the people should rightly fear those people.

As has been said: “When people fear the government, there is tyranny; when the government fears the people, there is liberty.”

But this administration believes that the greatest threat to our country is its own people, its own citizens. This is what oppressive regimes say.

This administration never misses an opportunity to attack the Second Amendment by seeking to tax and regulate away our constitutional rights.

They have blamed law-abiding citizens and licensed firearms dealers for the recent surge in violent crime in Democrat-run cities.

They have nominated a gun-grabbing radical named David Chipman to lead the ATF.

President Biden has himself repeatedly belittled gun owners and their belief that the right to bear arms is essential to freedom. But President Biden's opinion does not change the Constitution or the Second Amendment.

In fact, with Biden's crime surge, Biden's border surge, and Democrat efforts to weaken and undermine law enforcement, it is no wonder someone recently said to me: “I carry a gun because I can't carry a cop.”

Thomas Jefferson once wrote: “What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms.”

The Second Amendment protects all other rights and freedoms.

As my friend CHIP ROY from Texas said last week at an event we were at together: “We will live free.”

The Second Amendment is critical to ensuring that we live free.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank the good gentleman and my good friend, Representative GOOD from Virginia, for his inspiring words.

As previously noted, Madam Speaker, the Biden administration has issued a proposed rule that would misinterpret the law and criminalize pistols with stabilizing braces. My friend from Virginia, Mr. GOOD, has introduced legislation to right this wrong and provide clear and accurate definitions for both rifles and pistols to avoid infringing on individuals' Second Amendment rights, and that is H.R. 3823.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. MOORE), my good friend from Alabama's Second District.

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I thank and appreciate Representative CLYDE for his leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, recent remarks by President Joe Biden about the Second Amendment have troubled me and millions of Americans who own firearms. I think they should trouble people on both sides of the aisle. I also believe his remarks and attitude toward gun owners should trouble all freedom-loving

Americans, regardless of whether they own a gun.

You see, President Biden's comments about restricting the Second Amendment show a fundamental misunderstanding of the relationship between this Nation's government and its people.

President Biden believes that the American people get their rights from the government. Our Founders would strongly disagree.

In fact, they were so skeptical of a powerful central government that they created an innovative and remarkable system of checks and balances to protect its citizens from a tyrannical government.

As it was so eloquently phrased in our Declaration of Independence: “to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed . . .”

What powers our Government possesses was given to it by the people, not the other way around. And we gave these powers to the Government to protect the rights we hold dear.

The Second Amendment does not apply to a particular firearm. It does not specify an AR-15, nor does it list a musket or a bayonet. It didn't have to, because the Second Amendment protects the right that you already have, the right to bear arms. There is no need to continually update the Second Amendment.

Madam Speaker, the Second Amendment is not a permission slip, but an assurance that no law will be enacted to strip the American people of their fundamental right.

The language of the Second Amendment is clear. And it says: “The right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.”

This right was so important to the Founders that they would not enact the Constitution without the Second Amendment's inclusion in the Bill of Rights.

President Biden's remarks betray the flawed reasoning of so many in the Democratic Party, who insist that the government is the grantor of rights. It is not grantor but the guarantor, the protector. The government simply cannot grant rights given to us by God. It protects those God-given rights.

Americans should be skeptical of any philosophy asserting the government can restrict the rights we have given it the power to protect. If they take your guns, what is next? The right to trial by jury? Maybe free speech? The right to worship who and how we choose?

Madam Speaker, for the American people to keep the liberty we hold dear, our constitutional protections, all of them, must be maintained.

Thomas Jefferson said it this way: “When the government fears people, there is liberty. When the people fear the government, there is tyranny.”

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank the good gentleman from Alabama for those inspiring remarks.

I want to talk about privately-made firearms, which I briefly referenced in my introductory remarks.

Undeniably, the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms, has been fundamental to the freedom and security of our Nation since it was first founded in 1776. It is the teeth behind so many of the other rights and liberties we enjoy.

We know this to be true, because history has shown us that when the right to keep and bear arms falls, then the right of free speech and of the free press falls immediately after.

From our very beginning until today, for almost 250 years, people have always been able to build their own firearms. But that right is at risk, considering the White House's gun control agenda.

Under the Gun Control Act of 1968, commercial firearm manufacturers, importers, firearm distributors, and retail firearm dealers had to get Federal Government licenses in order to continue to operate their businesses. Along with those licenses came record-keeping requirements and compliance inspections to ensure they followed the new laws and regulations. This effectively put almost all firearm manufacturers and importers under the direct control of the Federal Government.

History also tells us, Madam Speaker, that after registration comes confiscation. We saw it happen in Russia after the 1917 Communist revolution; in Nazi Germany in 1938; in Australia in 1996; and most recently, in New Zealand in 2019.

In those countries, national registration led to eventual confiscation. Now the ATF wants even privately made firearms under their total control. To make component parts like upper housing and slides, those parts that can hold a firing pin or a bolt or a bolt carrier, to make those simple parts into a serialized firearm will have a chilling effect on privately made firearms.

In fact, it could completely eliminate privately made firearms, finally placing all manufacture of firearms under complete government control. Those fears are genuinely based, and we see that today with ATF trying to legislate by redefining the meaning of words or creating new ones that don't even exist in the written law.

As I noted earlier in the hour, Madam Speaker, I share the passion of my Democrat colleagues in keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals. But in achieving that shared goal, we cannot trample on the Second Amendment rights of citizens.

If the ATF succeeds in pushing these new definitions across the finish line, Madam Speaker, I fear that we will be opening the floodgates to allowing the agency to regulate our God-given Second Amendment rights right out of existence.

I don't plan to allow that to happen. Not on my watch, Madam Speaker. I don't think my colleagues who filled these seats earlier plan to allow that to happen either.



Together, with the support of the American people, we will never give one inch in the defense of the Second Amendment.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN), my good friend who represents Kansas' First District and introduced H.R. 1758, the Home Defense and Competitive Shooting Act of 2021.

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this important Special Order to highlight a basic right that we all share and love and that makes us who we are as Americans.

Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss President Biden's misuse of the executive order and its harmful impact on law-abiding citizens.

In 1789, George Washington penned the first executive order, directing the heads of his departments to submit reports on their operations.

In 1957, my fellow Kansan, Dwight D. Eisenhower used the executive order to send Federal troops to integrate public schools in Little Rock, Arkansas.

□ 2045

Nearly every United States President has issued executive orders like these to instruct the government how to work within the parameters set by the Congress and the Constitution. Until now.

In his first 10 days as President, Joe Biden issued 25 executive orders, more than the last seven Presidents combined in their first 10 days. And the list continues to grow. Today, we are up to nearly 60 executive orders and more executive actions and memoranda than I care to count.

The power to issue executive orders is derived from Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution, which states that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

When orders are based in facts and stakeholder engagement, like those we saw with Washington and Eisenhower, they work well to steward the execution of said laws. When the power to issue an executive order is abused, though, used to strong-hand the minority or circumvent Congress, the orders become a dangerous tool to undermine the American people and our democracy. This is what is happening right now.

President Biden recently penned six anti-Second Amendment executive actions in one day, banning handmade guns altogether; defining a pistol as a short-barreled rifle, allowing for more intense regulation; and mandating a report on gun gifting and trading.

In a recent interview on gun control, a spokesperson for President Biden stated: "The President will not wait for Congress to act before the administration takes our own steps, fully within the administration's authority and the Second Amendment."

We can no longer sit idle and watch dozens of executive orders from a single administration attempt to dictate

the direction of our country with no input from this Congress. Congress was created to legislate.

Governing by executive order is not legislating. That is why I introduced H.R. 716, the More Accountability is Necessary Now Act, requiring the executive branch to notify the American public and this Congress with its intent to issue any new executive order or revoking any executive order that pertains to our Second Amendment rights.

I also introduced H.R. 1758, the Home Defense and Competitive Shooting Act, pushing back on President Biden's intent to redefine pistols as short-barreled rifles and eliminating the prohibition on transporting short-barreled rifles in interstate commerce.

I invite my colleagues to cosponsor both of these pieces of legislation as we stand up against any efforts, including shameful executive overreach, to diminish or weaken the rights of law-abiding Americans to own, carry, and use firearms.

The Second Amendment is a load-bearing wall in our Constitution. If you weaken a load-bearing wall, it is bad for the entire structure.

We must and we will push back against the relentless attacks on our Second Amendment rights.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, while any infringement of our Second Amendment rights is unconstitutional, policymakers have imposed even stricter regulations on some types of firearms, particularly short-barreled rifles. I truly appreciate my friend from Kansas' First District correcting this by introducing the Home Defense and Competitive Shooting Act of 2021, which will accurately classify short-barreled rifles as semiautomatic rifles, as they should be. They should be semiautomatic rifles and only semiautomatic rifles and regulated as such.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for affording my colleagues and me the opportunity to stand before you today in defense of the Second Amendment and to highlight commonsense, conservative-led proposals to protect and preserve our rights.

Madam Speaker, I thank each of my colleagues for their participation this evening. Their respective constituents should be proud to have such staunch defenders of the Second Amendment representing them in the people's House.

Though several of my colleagues who have introduced proposals could not join us tonight, the American people should know that the solutions highlighted in the last hour are not exhaustive of our efforts to restore, protect, and preserve our God-given right to keep and bear arms. Rather, the solutions presented tonight are just the tip of the iceberg.

Madam Speaker, I again reiterate to you my sincere hope that the American people will take the opportunity to share their thoughts with the ATF on the two proposed regulations that I mentioned, as you can see on this

board right here, as they have the potential to upend not only the firearms manufacturing industry but also the legality of guns in homes across the country as we know it.

My constituents sent me to Congress to do everything in my power to protect and uphold the Constitution, and I plan to do just that so long as they entrust me with their voting card.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### CBC SUPPORTS INVESTING IN INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the subject of this Special Order hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight for the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour on this critically important topic, infrastructure. Tonight, we will share with you our positions, our plans, and the state of what we think about infrastructure.

I am so honored to be here tonight as a coanchor and as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. Traditionally, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE would be here as our lead anchor. I thank her for allowing me, as chair, to stand in for her.

I am so honored that her coanchor will now be my coanchor tonight. It gives me great pleasure to talk about all of our members, Madam Speaker, but we are joined by someone who is not only a freshman but a freshman who is a leader, a freshman who is strong, a freshman from New York's 15th District, someone who came to Congress with a plan, someone who came to Congress saying that he wants to be here and be able to be a part not only of the Congressional Black Caucus but to be able to stand up and stand out and make a difference for his constituents. Madam Speaker, he has done far more than that.

Congressman RITCHIE TORRES serves on the powerful Financial Services Committee as a freshman. He is a leader when we talk about housing and infrastructure. Tonight, I get to dialogue with him. I get to listen to him, and we get to talk about other members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Tonight, we want to speak directly to the American people and reflect on